

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

JAMES B. MORRIS,

No. CV 07-1378-PK

Plaintiff,

OPINION AND ORDER

v.

RAVESIM, INC., a Delaware Corporation,

Defendant.

MOSMAN, J.,

On March 26, 2008, Magistrate Judge Papak issued Findings and Recommendation ("F&R") (#43) in the above-captioned case recommending that both Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (#14) and Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (#17) be DENIED. Defendant filed Objections to the F&R, Plaintiff filed a Response to those Objections, and Defendant filed a Reply to the Plaintiff's Response.

The magistrate judge makes only recommendations to the court, to which any party may file written objections. The court is not bound by the recommendations of the magistrate judge, but retains responsibility for making the final determination. The court is generally required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). However, the court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the F&R to which no objections are

addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). While the level of scrutiny under which I am required to review the F&R depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, I am free to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's F&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

Upon review, I agree with Judge Papak's recommendation, and I ADOPT the F&R as my own opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 25th day of June, 2008.

/s/ Michael W. Mosman
MICHAEL W. MOSMAN
United States District Court